



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,162	07/30/2003	Irena Hudis	13768.429	7646
47973	7590	12/19/2008	EXAMINER	
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			POPHAM, JEFFREY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2437	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/630,162	HUDIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JEFFREY D. POPHAM	2437	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 24-32,34 and 36 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 24-32,34 and 36 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

Remarks

Claims 24-32, 34, and 36 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/31/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/31/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that "one advantage of the present embodiments is that the security rules of items can be determined without using ACL's for each item." It is first noted, with respect to ACLs, that neither of the independent claims refer to any ACL, and only claim 36 refers to such an access control list. With respect to the advantage noted by Applicant, this is not seen within any of the claims. The requirements of claim 24, for example, are that a first non-overlapping security zone contains items for which common security rules are enforced. The means to perform such enforcement are not described as being any master ACL or the like for the zone. Additionally, claim 36 only

refers to the security rules comprising an ACL defining rights a principal has to the items in the security zone associated with the security rules. The inherited ACL (of Schmuck) which defines common security rules for all entities that inherit the ACL fits this description.

Applicant argues that, in the instant application, "once a user has access to a security zone, access right lists no longer need to be determined when accessing each item within the zone, since the security rules are enforced to be consistent within the zone." The claims, however, pertain to delegating administrative rights, and not to how a user would access the security zone. It is further noted here, that the application discloses a single security right granting a user access to one item while denying the user access to another item within the same zone (page 18, paragraph 50, for example). Therefore, access rights would have to be verified for every item that the user accesses.

Applicant goes on to state that Schmuck "states that there are typically groups of related files that all have the same access rights associated with them", but, "nowhere is it found that the access rights are enforced as being the same for each related file." As just described by Applicant, there are groups of related files that all have the same access rights associated therewith within Schmuck.

Applicant also argues that Schmuck may allow a user to change an ACL. The changing of an ACL in Schmuck would be equivalent to creating a new zone in the current application, and therefore, of no detriment. If security rules were meant to be

permanent and never changing, there would be no difference between the security rules of any zone or item within the system.

It is further noted, with respect to what a security rule is, that the current application refers to administrative rights as being within the realm of security rules. This can be seen, for example, in paragraph 52 on page 18, stating that "a rule may specify a set of principals including all network administrators while excluding a particular administrator." Therefore, administrative rights are within the broader security rules and may be used in rejection of such. Realizing this, one can easily see that Barnett teaches that each zone will have commonly enforced security rules, being the administrative rights (delegation, edit, and possibly others, such as view, modify, delete, and temporary delegation).

Claim Objections

3. Claims 24 and 34 are objected to because of the following informalities: Each of claims 24 and 34 recite "the common security rules" in at least the final limitation. However, there are 2 instances of "common security rules" within each of the claims. As the claims stand, the common security rules mentioned in the final limitation could refer to either of the common security rules. For purposes of prior art rejection, "the common security rules" of the final limitation have been construed as those being associated with the first zone. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 24, 25, 27-32, 34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett (U.S. Patent 6,772,157) in view of Schmuck (U.S. Patent 6,021,508).

Regarding Claim 24,

Barnett discloses in a computer system that includes items stored in at least one volume being divided into at least one security zone, each of the at least one security zone being defined as a grouping of items having common security rules, each item residing in a security zone from among the at least one security zone, each security zone having one or more principals with administrative rights, a method of delegating administrative rights to other principals for first items included in a main security zone included in the at least one security zone, comprising:

An act of identifying first items for which common security rules are to be enforced and other items for which common security rules are to be maintained independent from the common security rules of the identified first items residing in a main security zone within a volume comprising a plurality of security zones (Column 5, lines 4-34; Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34);

An act of splitting the main security zone into a first security zone containing the identified first items for which common security rules are to be enforced and a remaining main security zone having the other items having common security rules that are not dependent upon the common security rules of the first security zone, the one or more main principals retaining administrative rights for the first security zone and the remaining main security zone, the first security zone including the first items and the remaining main security zone including only the other items from the main security zone not included in the first items (Column 5, lines 4-34; Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34), and

An act of specifying that one or more first principals also have administrative rights to the first security zone containing the first items, such that the entirety of items in the first security zone necessarily have the common security rules (Column 5, lines 4-34; Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34);

But may not explicitly disclose that the zones are non-overlapping.

Schmuck, however, discloses identifying first items for which common security rules are to be enforced and other items for which common security rules are to be maintained independent from the common security rules of the identified first items; a first non-overlapping security zone of items having common security rules such that the entirety of items in the first non-overlapping security zone necessarily have the

common security rules and a remaining non-overlapping main security zone having common security rules that are not dependent upon the common security rules of the first non-overlapping security zone such that the first non-overlapping security zone and the remaining non-overlapping main security zone do not overlap with any of the plurality of other non-overlapping security zones included in the volume, and that the splitting is restricted in such a way as to prevent overlapping between security zones and such that none of the first items and other items from the main non-overlapping security zone are shared when the main non-overlapping security zone is split wherein the security zones thereby have a dynamic configurable granularity of items having common security rules (Column 27, line 10 to Column 28, line 59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the ACL system of Schmuck into the delegated administration system of Barnett in order to provide an access control mechanism that allows the same physical storage to be shared and referenced by any item that has the same security rules, thereby reducing the memory used by such security rules and allowing faster and more efficient access control determinations.

Regarding Claim 25,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses that specifying the one or more first

principals is performed by the one or more main principals (Column 6, lines 13-52).

Regarding Claim 27,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses the administrative rights being security rights (Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34).

Regarding Claim 28,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses the administrative rights being auditing rights (Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34).

Regarding Claim 29,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses specifying security rules for the first security zone after the act of splitting (Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34); and Schmuck discloses that the zones are non-overlapping (Column 27, line 10 to Column 28, line 59).

Regarding Claim 30,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses specifying security rules for the first security zone by defaulting the security rules that were from the main security zone prior to the act of splitting (Column 5, line 35 to Column 6, line 65); and

Schmuck discloses that the zones are non-overlapping (Column 27, line 10 to Column 28, line 59).

Regarding Claim 31,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses recombining the first security zone and the remaining main security zone (Column 6, lines 53-65; and Column 12, line 45 to Column 13, line 8); and Schmuck discloses that the zones are non-overlapping (Column 27, line 10 to Column 28, line 59).

Regarding Claim 32,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses a subsequent remaining main security zone, the subsequent remaining main security zone formed from splitting the remaining main security zone, wherein the administrative principals of the subsequent remaining main security zone are the administrative principals in the main security zone, comprising an act of recombining the first security zone and the subsequent remaining main security zone (Column 6, lines 53-65; and Column 12, line 45 to Column 13, line 8); and Schmuck discloses that the zones are non-overlapping (Column 27, line 10 to Column 28, line 59).

Regarding Claim 36,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Schmuck discloses that the security rules comprise an access

control list defining the rights a principal has to the items in the security zone associated with the security rules (Column 27, line 10 to Column 28, line 59).

Regarding Claim 34,

Claim 34 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 36 and is rejected for the same reasons.

5. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett in view of Schmuck, further in view of Anglin (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0199521).

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, associating an identical reference with the first items, referring to the zone's security rules (Column 27, line 10 to Column 29, line 59); but does not explicitly disclose labeling the items with a zone enumeration corresponding to the first zone.

Anglin, however discloses labeling the first items with a security zone enumeration corresponding to the first non-overlapping security zone (Paragraphs 19, 24, and 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the group management system of Anglin into the delegated administration system of Barnett as modified by Schmuck in order to explicitly associate items with their

appropriate zone, as well as to associate a zone entry with all of the items that belong to that zone, thereby increasing ease of viewing, management, and use of the system.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Maheshwari (U.S. Patent 7,152,165).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY D. POPHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey D Popham
Examiner
Art Unit 2437

/Jeffrey D Popham/
Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437